



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 1293.1072D/MDS 4176 09/610,380 07/05/2000 Seong-jin Moon 07/07/2003 STAAS & HALSEY LLP EXAMINER **SUITE 700** TRAN, THAI Q 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2615 DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	plicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/610,380	MOON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thai Tran	2615
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		l ()
THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	S APPLICATION IN CONDITIOn oil abandonment of this application in a timely filed amendment which is appeal fee); or (3) a time	ON FOR ALLOWANCE. ation. A proper reply to a
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TO date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding among the corresponding the correspo	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ce later than three months after the ma CFR 1.704(b).	iling date of the final rejection, even if
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been cons	idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	:(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo)⊡ will be entered and an ow or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>4-10 and 15-46</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10. Other:		

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)



Contine attion of 2. NOTE: adding "and/or reproducing" in claim 4, line 1, deleting "rewritable" in claim 4, line 2 and deleting ", and made a second determination whether the optical pickup is to read the content based upon the first determination" in claim 31, last three lines raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections have not been addressed and it appears that the references can not be combined.

PRIVARY EXAMINER